

Application No.: 10/615,407  
Inventor: SANTISI, Phillip  
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2007  
Docket No.: 8106.002.US

### **Remarks/Arguments**

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-10, 12-17, 21-24, 26-31, and 33-38 remain pending in this application. Claims 8-9, 16, 23-24, and 27-28 are amended herein. Claims 11, 18-20, 25, 32, and 39-41 have been cancelled. Further consideration of this application is earnestly requested.

No new matter or new issues are raised by the present amendments.

#### **Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Figure 1 has been amended to show the invention as being “in parallel two-dimensional planes” as claimed in Claim 9. Figure 5 has been deleted from the application.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 USC § 112 as allegedly indefinite for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended claim 9, Figure 1, and paragraph [0030], thereby obviating the rejection.

In view of the above, the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20, 23-25, 27-29, 32 and 39-41 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for allegedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that the claims as amended obviate the rejection.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)**

Application No.: 10/615,407  
Inventor: SANTISI, Phillip  
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2007  
Docket No.: 8106.002.US

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20, 23-25, 27-29, 32 and 39-41 under 35 USC § 102(b), as being allegedly anticipated by Prosen (US 5035558). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 requires a hook portion comprising “a first section, a second section, and a third section, wherein the first section is connected to and perpendicular with the second section, and the second section is perpendicular with the third section.” This is shown in Figs. 1 and 2. Prosen fails to disclose a hook portion as described above. Prosen discloses, as shown in Figs. 2 and 5, a number of teeth 4, contained by the mouth of the slot 14, which is contained in shank 12. As Applicant has deleted Fig. 5 from the Specification, the rejection based on Fig. 5 is properly obviated. The shank 12, tapered slot 13, mouth of the slot 14, and teeth 4 of the clasp 3 of Prosen do not anticipate Applicant’s hook portion sections as detailed above, since shank 12 does not include a “first section (is) connected to and perpendicular with the second section, and the second section is perpendicular with the third section,” but rather a series of non-perpendicular teeth 4 and a curved (non-perpendicular) tapered slot 13. As to Claims 6-8, the “relative dimensions” stated by the Examiner are not anticipated since the shank 12 has no discernable sections as described by the Examiner and the teeth 4 are not perpendicular to each other, as Applicant’s sections (detailed above). As to Claim 10, as Fig. 5 has been deleted from the Specification, the rejection based on Fig. 5 is properly obviated. Claims 11 and 18 have been cancelled. As to Claim 21, the argument above is incorporated by reference.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 2-5, 12, 13, 22-24, 26-28, 30 and 31 under 35 USC § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Prosen (US 5035558) in view of Chuan (US 4831692). The arguments above are incorporated by reference. Applicant’s perpendicular hook portion sections (as detailed above) are not taught or suggested by the combination of Prosen and Chuan, as Claim 2 is dependent upon Claim 1, and incorporates all the elements of Claim 1. As the Examiner points out, the Prosen hook of Fig. 5 is an intermediate hook, i.e., not at an end,

Application No.: 10/615,407  
Inventor: SANTISI, Phillip  
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2007  
Docket No.: 8106.002.US

whereas Applicant clearly claims a “terminus” location.

As to Claim 5, there is no teaching or suggestion by Prosen and Chuan to incorporate the perpendicular hook sections (as detailed above) in a manner disclosed by Applicant.

As to Claim 22, Prosen does disclose separating the cord from the grip with a pinch portion incorporating the perpendicular hook portions sections as claimed by Applicant.

As to Claims 12, 13, 27 and 28, Chuan does not suggest or teach the use of any material for forming Applicant’s perpendicular hook sections (as detailed above) in a manner disclosed by Applicant.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-14 under 35 USC § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Prosen (US 5035558) in view of Simon (US 3328064). The arguments above are incorporated by reference. There is no motivation or suggestion by Prosen and Simon to utilize any material to form Applicant’s invention, including the perpendicular hook section portions.

As to Claim 29, Applicant submits that Claim 29 as amended obviates the rejection and the argument of the previous paragraph is incorporated by reference.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the above rejections is courteously requested.

Application No.: 10/615,407  
Inventor: SANTISI, Phillip  
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2007  
Docket No.: 8106.002.US

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including Extension of Time fees to Deposit Account No. 14-1437. Please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP

  
Jeffery B. Lesperance

Registration No.: 57182

Customer No.: 26474  
1300 Eye St. N.W.  
1000 West Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Phone: (202) 659-0100  
Fax: (202) 659-0105

Dated: April 24, 2007